

Date: Fri, 22 Jul 94 04:30:14 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #322
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Fri, 22 Jul 94 Volume 94 : Issue 322

Today's Topics:

 New policy on renewal dates on licenses
 Re: reply
 reply
 short cuts

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Thu, 21 Jul 94 09:35:00 -0400
From: hearst.acc.Virginia.EDU!ppplace!pat.wilson@uunet.uu.net
Subject: New policy on renewal dates on licenses
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

-> Message-ID: <30kdh4\$ar3@news.parc.xerox.com>
-> Newsgroup: rec.radio.amateur.policy
-> Organization: Xerox PARC
->
-> Last night on the Section Managers net they read a letter from the
-> ARRL stating that the FCC would no longer automatically extend the
-> expiration date of a amateur license every time you sent in a 610.
-> They stated that like the other radio services the renewal would be
-> handled only as a renewal, and only when a license was about to
-> expire. Has anyone else heard any details about this?
->
-> Rich Hyde
-> KD6WYK

Well, this only makes sense, if you think about it. The license does not expire for 10 years and with the pay for say (vanity calls) goes into effect, then the period is fixed anyhow. But, simply changing address, etc, probably should not be a reason for extension.

Pat
N0RDQ

Date: Thu, 21 Jul 1994 16:06:19 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!wotan.compaq.com!
twisto.eng.hou.compaq.com!news@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Re: reply
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>>And I'll add to this that, unlike most hobbies, we have obtained our
>>"clubhouse" (our frequencies) from the Feds via an explicit agreement
>>(see Part 97.1), which I would paraphrase as "here's some spectrum, now
>>learn something".

>
>Exactly. It's too bad that most devote 100% of their time to rag-chewing
>and contesting rather than learning ANYTHING beyond what limited knowledge
>was required to get the ticket.

>
Obviously you havn't been in a contesting station. Maybe the radio isn't
homebrew, but
many of the other pieces are. Custom parts are very predominant in contest
stations.
Antenna switching arrays, amplifiers, voice synthesizers, memory keyers, logging
networks,
and many other homebrew and custom parts are found in contest stations. A station
that
runs multi-multi will have even more homebrew parts because nobody makes some of
the
equipment needed. When was the last time you saw a commercial 160 meter 4 square
and
how many commercial 80 meter yagis are there?

The ragchewer's maybe members of the QCAO but not a self respecting tester.

Earl Morse
KZ8E
KZ8E@bangate.compaq.com

Date: Thu, 21 Jul 1994 13:27:26 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!math.ohio-state.edu!uwm.edu!mixcom.com!
kevin.jessup@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: reply
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In <415@ted.win.net> mjsilva@ted.win.net (Michael Silva) writes:

>>Why are points not awarded for equipment of one's own design? Why, in fact,
>>are there ABSOLUTELY NO ARRL competitions involved with DESIGN? IMO, this
>>is a serious problem with amateur radio today. The "this is a hobby not a
>>career" camp should take a closer look at other hobbies! Then again,
>>perhaps they prefer to place amateur radio on the same level as basket
>>weaving and finger-painting.

>And I'll add to this that, unlike most hobbies, we have obtained our
>"clubhouse" (our frequencies) from the Feds via an explicit agreement
>(see Part 97.1), which I would paraphrase as "here's some spectrum, now
>learn something".

Exactly. It's too bad that most devote 100% of their time to rag-chewing
and contesting rather than learning ANYTHING beyond what limited knowledge
was required to get the ticket.

--

kevin.jessup@mixcom.com		Vote Libertarian!
		Call 1-800-682-1776
		for more information.

Date: Thu, 21 Jul 94 09:40:00 -0400
From: hearst.acc.Virginia.EDU!pplace!pat.wilson@uunet.uu.net
Subject: short cuts
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I don't know if the person who complained about IMHO or IMNSHO is
listening, but these short cuts have nothing to do with amateur radio,
but are simply computer-ease (yes, I know) for things that MOST who use
the keyboard are aware.

For example:

ROTFLMAO = rolling on the floor, laughing my ass off.
ROTFL = rolling on the floor, laughing.
RTFO = right the f*** on.
RTFM = read the f***ing manual.

IMHO = in my humble opinion.
IMNSHO = in my NOT so humble opinion.
BTW = by the way.

etc.

So there you go, simply our way of being brief (:->

Pat

Date: Thu, 21 Jul 1994 12:20:35 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!howland.reston.ans.net!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!ukma!
rsg1.er.usgs.gov!stc06.CTD.ORN.L.GOV!xdepc.eng.ornl.gov!wyn@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <30h7mk\$a18@chnews.intel.com>, <wyn.58.2E2D7AF4@ornl.gov>,
<30l75p\$9ob@eram.esi.com.au>OV
Subject : Re: CW ... My view.

In article <30l75p\$9ob@eram.esi.com.au> dave@eram.esi.com.au (Dave Horsfall)
writes:

>In article <wyn.58.2E2D7AF4@ornl.gov>,
> wyn@ornl.gov (C. C. Wynn) writes:

>| In another forum Coffman wrote that among other things it takes a dual
>| channel 100 Mhz Oscope to align the GRAPES modem/radio after
 ^^^^^^^^
>| construction.

>He most certainly did not! In rec.radio.amateur.digital.misc, he said:

>> and some experience with digital and RF circuitry is helpful. The
>> minimum test equipment you will need is a dual trace oscilloscope
>> capable of XY operation to at least 100 kHz. (That's almost any
>> dual trace scope.) The usual RF test equipment, signal generator
>> and monitor receiver, are also helpful, but you can just loopback
>> the transmitter to the receiver for tuneup and testing.

>Go read it again.

Oops, excuse me, and a thousand netapologies. That should have been
"...100kHz..." .

73,
C. C. (Clay) Wynn N4A0X
wyn@ornl.gov

• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •

References <1994Jul15.205054.1463@mixcom.mixcom.com>, <gregCt93H0.AKE@netcom.com>,
<072194060346Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>
Subject : Re: 11 meters taking it back!!

73,

C. C. (Clay) Wynn N4AOX
wyn@ornl.gov

=====
= Cooperation requires participation. Competition teaches cooperation. =
=====

..._ .. _.. _ _ . _.. . __. _ . _ _ _ .. _..

Date: Thu, 21 Jul 1994 06:03:00 EST
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!howland.reston.ans.net!usenet.ins.cwru.edu!
wariat.org!amcomp!dan@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <306g76\$20i@news.u.washington.edu>,
<1994Jul15.205054.1463@mixcom.mixcom.com>, <gregCt93H0.AKE@netcom.com>
Subject : Re: 11 meters taking it back!!

greg@netcom.com (Greg Bullough) writes:

>How can amateur radio justify such an idea, when, as a service, we have
>historically under-utilized thAe adjacent 10-meter band, and now are
>beginning to build a history of under-utilization on the 12-meter band?

But wait a minute, some say we have to keep CW testing as a entry bar so
we don't OVER-POPULATE the HF bands. Can't have both.

Dan

--

"Is life so dear, or peace so sweet, as to be purchased at the price
of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God! I know not what
course others may take, but as for me, GIVE ME LIBERTY, OR GIVE ME
DEATH!" -Patrick Henry, Virginia House of Burgesses on March 23,1775
=+=+=> Ted Kennedy's car has killed more people than my gun! - Me

Date: Thu, 21 Jul 1994 09:39:39 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!math.ohio-state.edu!magnus.acs.ohio-state.edu!
usenet.ins.cwru.edu!ns.mcs.kent.edu!kira.cc.uakron.edu!malgudi.oar.net!witch!ted!
mjsilva@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <395@ted.win.net>, <1994Jul14.155750.12239@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>,
<404@ted.win.net><30h7mk\$a18@chnews.intel.com>mcs.k
Reply-To : mjsilva@ted.win.net (Michael Silva)
Subject : Re: CW ... My view.

In article <30h7mk\$a18@chnews.intel.com>, Jim Bromley, W5GYJ

(jbromley@sedona.intel.com) writes:

>In article <404@ted.win.net>, Michael Silva <mjsilva@ted.win.net> wrote:

>>4) Our no-codes just aren't interested in building, in which case we
>> had better re-examine the entire Tech license experiment, because
>> the big argument for it, the one that convinced me, was that there
>> were all these sharp characters who would jump into the hobby if
>> they just didn't have to learn the code....

>

>I don't think they are interested in winding their own coils and cutting
>their own capacitors from shim stock. I think they are interested in
>building their own antennas, interfacing their off-the-shelf radios
>to their computers through an inexpensive TNC, eliminating RFI in
>their mobiles and pursuing other radio system integration tasks.

>

The only thing I would say to this is that amateur radio is a hobby
with RF at it's core. I hope we don't end up with a whole class of
licencees who start with an off-the-shelf radio and go from there.

>> Have we instead just duplicated GMRS with more channels?

>

>That is actually a rather good paradigm to follow. We could do
>a lot worse.

Yes, no doubt we could, but our tradition and our charter (Part 97)
require that we, as a whole, be more.

>

>>I don't care if people build CW projects or FM projects, any more than
>>I care if they own red cars or blue cars. I just see an awful lot of
>>CW rigs being built, and I think the reason is the *combination* of
>>ease of construction *and* reward of operation. If you have another
>>explanation, let us hear it.

>

>I think it is the result of HF legal restrictions and radically
>different operational modes on VHF. And economics. I think if
>a straight-forward, reliable and capable VHF transceiver kit was
>available at a reasonable price, there would be a lot of building
>going on among technician-class amateurs.

>

I have always felt that we have got it completely backwards in putting
new hams with minimal knowledge (some have much more, but that's all
the test requires) on VHF+, where I think experimenting tends to be
more difficult, and expectations for equipment higher. I think the
combination of those three factors ends up killing the experimenting
impulse in a lot of newcomers.

73,
Mike, KK6GM

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #322
